


02-14-05

AF/ZW  
1756



Attorney's Docket No. 038190/201827

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.: 10/016,277

Confirmation No.: 3510

Applicant(s): Peter Hsiuen Wu

Filed: November 2, 2001

Art Unit: 1756

Examiner: Ruggles, John S.

Title: RADIATION CURABLE MASKANT AND LINE SEALER FOR  
PROTECTING METAL SUBSTRATES

Docket No.: 038190/201827

Customer No.: 00826

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPEAL BRIEF TRANSMITTAL**  
**(PATENT APPLICATION – 37 C.F.R. § 41.37)**

This is the second submission of the Appeal Brief in this application. The new Appeal Brief addresses the points raised in the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed on January 11, 2005.

It is our belief that no fee is required since we previously paid the Appeal Brief fee with the first filing on December 21, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher M. Humphrey  
Registration No. 43,683

**CUSTOMER NO. 00826**

**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**

Bank of America Plaza

101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000

Charlotte, NC 28280-4000

Tel Raleigh Office (919) 862-2200


Fax Raleigh Office (919) 862-2260

"Express Mail" mailing label number EV 387070178 US

Date of Deposit: February 11, 2005

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patent, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

  
Polly P. Burton



Attorney Docket No. 038190/201827

PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appl. No.: 10/016,277 Confirmation No.: 3510  
Applicant(s): Peter Hsiuen Wu  
Filed: November 2, 2001  
Art Unit: 1756  
Examiner: Ruggles, John S.  
Title: RADIATION CURABLE MASKANT AND LINE SEALER FOR  
PROTECTING METAL SUBSTRATES

Docket No.: 038190/201827  
Customer No.: 00826

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR § 41.37**

This Appeal Brief is filed pursuant to the "Notice of Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences" filed October 21, 2004.

1. ***Real Party in Interest***

The real party in interest in this appeal is The Boeing Company, the assignee of the above-referenced patent application.

2. ***Related Appeals and Interferences***

There are no related appeals and/or interferences involving this application or its subject matter.

3. ***Status of Claims***

Claims 1-49 are pending and stand rejected as unpatentable over various combinations of prior art references as set forth in greater detail below. The prior art rejections of all pending claims is appealed herein. Claims 50-63 have been cancelled.

4. *Status of Amendments*

There are no amendments that have not been entered. The claims set forth in the attached appendix include all amendments submitted during prosecution.

5. *Summary of Claimed Subject Matter*

The present invention provides an improved maskant and line sealer for protecting metal substrates, such as aircraft fuselage panels, that do not require the presence of water or other solvents that can lead to increased toxicity and undesirably long drying times (see Applicant's Background of the Invention section, pages 1-2). To overcome the problems associated with prior art maskant compositions, Applicant has developed a substantially solvent-free and actinic radiation curable masking composition. The compositions of the invention exhibit greatly reduced curing times and reduce the need for reapplication of the maskant. Additionally, the compositions of the invention pose fewer toxicity or environmental concerns because use of toxic organic solvents is avoided. As noted in Claim 1, the method of the invention comprises applying a maskant coating that is radiation curable and substantially solvent-free. As recited in dependent Claim 3, the maskant composition may comprise at least one polymerizable monomer or oligomer and a photoinitiator.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of protecting selected portions of a metal substrate from chemical exposure. The claimed method includes the steps of applying a maskant coating composition to at least a portion of the surface of a metal substrate, the maskant composition being radiation curable and substantially solvent-free. This step is discussed, for instance, on pages 2 (lines 28-31), 5 (lines 19-25), 9 (lines 17-31), and 10 (lines 1-6). This step is identified as reference number 30 in Figure 2. The method also includes the step of exposing the coated substrate to actinic radiation to cure the maskant and form a cured peelable film adhered to the substrate. This step is described, for example, on pages 2 (line 31), 3 (lines 1-3; 8-12), 6 (lines 24-30), 7 (lines 1-19), and 10 (lines 2-14). This step is identified as reference number 40 in Figure 2. The method of Claim 1 further recites the step of subjecting the coated substrate to a chemical treatment. This step is described, for example, on pages 3 (lines 2-3) and 11 (lines 8-18), and identified as reference number 90 in Figure 2.

Independent Claim 19 is also directed to a method of protecting selected portions of a metal substrate from chemical exposure. This claim also includes the “applying” and “subjecting” steps noted in connection with Claim 1, except the maskant is not required to be radiation curable and substantially solvent-free. The same sections of the specification and drawings identified above apply to these method steps. Claim 19 also includes the step of curing the maskant composition to form a cured peelable maskant film adhered to the metal substrate, which is a broader step encompassing the “exposing” step of Claim 1, and the same sections of the specification and drawings noted above in connection with that limitation of Claim 1 apply to this step. Claim 19 also includes the step of scribing a predetermined pattern of lines in the maskant film, the scribed lines outlining portions of the maskant film to be removed. This step is described, for example, on pages 4 (lines 3-6), 5 (lines 13-14), and 10 (lines 15-22), and identified as reference number 50 in Figure 2. Claim 19 further recites the step of applying a radiation curable and substantially solvent-free line sealant composition to the scribed lines. This step is described, for example, on pages 4 (lines 5-7), 5 (lines 13-14), and 10 (lines 23-28), and identified as reference number 60 in Figure 2. Claim 19 also recites the step of exposing the line sealant composition to actinic radiation to cure the composition. This step is described, for example, on pages 4 (lines 6-7), 8 (lines 22-31), 9 (lines 1-11), 10 (lines 28-31), and 11 (lines 1-5), and identified as reference number 70 in Figure 2. Finally, Claim 19 includes the step of peeling off a portion of the maskant film outlined by the scribed lines. This step is described, for example, on pages 4 (lines 7-10), 7 (lines 10-13), and 11 (lines 6-8), and identified as reference number 80 in Figure 2.

Independent Claim 48 is also directed to a method of protecting selected portions of a metal substrate from chemical exposure. Claim 48 is similar in many respects to both Claim 1 and Claim 19. As with Claim 1, Claim 48 recites that the maskant is radiation curable and substantially solvent-free. Thus, Claim 48 includes steps similar to the “applying” and “exposing” steps of Claim 1, except that the cured maskant film is further described as having a certain peel strength range, which is discussed on page 7 (lines 10-13). Claim 48 also includes the “scribing”, “applying a sealant”, “exposing the line sealant”, and “peeling” steps of Claim 19. Similar to the “subjecting” steps of Claims 1 and Claim 19, Claim 48 recites a step of immersing the substrate in a chemical milling bath, which is a more specific example of the chemical

treatment referenced in the other independent claims. Chemical milling baths are discussed, for example, on page 11 (lines 10-12). It is believed that the portions of Figure 2 and the specification mentioned in connection with Claims 1 and 19 above are also relevant to Claim 48 and should require no further elaboration.

6. ***Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal***

The Office Action includes five rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) involving a combination of the Maeda reference with one or more additional references. Specifically, Claims 1-15 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Maeda reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,773,487 to Sokol, U.S. Patent No. 5,260,350 to Wright and U.S. Patent No. 5,571,570 to Lake. Claims 16, 19-21, 26, 28-32, 35, 39-42 and 43-46 stand rejected as being unpatentable over the Maeda, Sokol, Wright and Lake references, and further in view of either U.S. Patent No. 5,126,005 to Blake or U.S. Patent No. 4,585,519 to Jaffe *et al.* Claims 22-23, 27, 33-34, 37-38, and 48-49 stand rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of the Maeda, Sokol, and Blake or Jaffe references. Claims 24-25 and 36 stand rejected as being unpatentable over the Maeda reference in view of either Blake or Jaffe, further in view of Sokol and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,136,880 to Snowwhite *et al.* Claim 47 stands rejected as being unpatentable over the Maeda and Sokol references in view of either Blake or Jaffe and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,716,270 to Gnanamuthu *et al.* In each rejection, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by Sokol to replace the water-based maskant composition of Maeda with the composition described in Sokol.

7. ***Argument***

**Rejection of Claims 1-15 and 17-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over U.S. Pat. No. 5,466,739 to Maeda et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,773,487 to Sokol, U.S. Pat. No. 5,260,350 to Wright and U.S. Pat. No. 5,571,570 to Lake**

Applicants respectfully submit that the above rejection should be overruled because there is no proper motivation to combine the Sokol reference with the Maeda reference. Further, even

if properly combinable, which Applicants obviously do not admit, the combined teachings of the references fail to teach or suggest exposing a substrate coated with a radiation curable and substantially solvent-free maskant composition to actinic radiation in order to cure the coating, as recited in Claim 1 (and thus each claim dependent thereon, including Claims 2-15 and 17-18). These arguments are explained below.

#### No Motivation to Combine Maeda and Sokol

Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine the Maeda and Sokol references as contemplated by the Examiner. The Maeda reference is directed to water-based maskant compositions and merely describes a prior art maskant composition that requires extensive drying to remove the water present in the composition. The Maeda reference notes in columns 1-2 that prior attempts to formulate a water-based maskant produced inferior results due to interaction of the coating with the alkali etchant bath (e.g., swelling of the mask), poor coating workability, and poor peelability. The Maeda reference teaches that the water-based formulation described therein provides good peelability and coating characteristics, as well as resistance to chemical attack. Clearly, all of the above characteristics are crucial to the application described in Maeda (i.e., a chemical milling maskant).

The Sokol reference, which is the only reference relied upon by the Examiner as teaching a solvent-free and radiation curable coating, is directed to compositions for use as finishing coatings for household items (see column 1, lines 18-44). There is absolutely no suggestion in the Sokol reference that the compositions described therein would be suitable for use as a peelable maskant composition resistant to an etching bath as required in the Maeda reference, as well as the Jaffe and Blake references. Sokol does not mention chemical milling maskant as a possible application for the coatings described therein. Further, there is nothing in the Sokol reference that describes the peelability or chemical resistance characteristics of the coatings discussed therein, which is not surprising since the focus in Sokol is on finishing coatings that are not intended for exposure to harsh chemical attack or intended to be peeled.

The Examiner has not explained why one of ordinary skill in the art would have the reasonable belief that the coatings of Sokol would meet the stringent requirements of a chemical

milling maskant. It is not reasonable to conclude that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to substitute the coating formulation of Sokol in the application described in Maeda simply because Sokol mentions that avoidance of volatile organic solvents can provide environmental benefits such as reduced fire risk and reduced deleterious health effects. Since the Maeda reference already describes the use of water-based formulations that contain no volatile organic solvents, the advantages of avoiding volatile organic solvents taught by Sokol would provide no motivation to modify the composition of Maeda. It is also insufficient to argue that the motivation arises from Sokol's description of quick curing of the polymerizable composition described therein. The coating composition of Maeda is polymerized prior to coating using a latex emulsion polymerization process, so the Maeda composition is not cured after coating, only dried to remove water. Thus, the quick curing described in Sokol is irrelevant to the type of coating described in Maeda.

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would certainly read the Maeda reference as requiring a coating that meets a number of performance criteria other than simply being capable of adhering to metal. Peelability and chemical resistance, for instance, are key requirements described in Maeda. The Examiner has not explained how the Sokol reference would suggest that the coatings described therein would meet such requirements. Instead, the office action dated 1/30/04 merely includes the statement that "a solvent free radiation curable acrylate coating ... would be expected to yield a peelable maskant functional in the process of Maeda." This statement is completely unsupported by any evidence of record. The Examiner's only other comment on this point is to note in the Advisory Action that the recognition of another advantage naturally flowing from the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability. However, Appellant is arguing precisely that there is no underlying suggestion in the art to arrive at the invention presently claimed.

Appellant respectfully submits that Sokol cannot be read to suggest that the coatings described therein would have the characteristics required by Maeda, and only impermissible hindsight would lead one to the combination proposed by the Examiner. One of ordinary skill in the art would simply find nothing in Sokol that provides a reasonable expectation that the Sokol coatings would function successfully in the application described in Maeda, which undermines any prima facie argument of obviousness based on these two references.

This conclusion becomes inescapable when considered in light of the discussion in Maeda of failed prior attempts to produce a workable maskant that avoids the use of volatile organic solvents. Due to the harsh environment produced by chemical milling baths and the need for peelability and good coating characteristics, it is difficult to produce a coating suitable for use as a maskant in a chemical milling application. This is made abundantly clear in the background discussion of Maeda. Sokol provides nothing to lead one of ordinary skill in the art to reasonably believe that the coatings of Sokol would have the necessary characteristics needed for a successful chemical milling maskant. Since the Examiner has failed to rebut this argument, Appellant requests reversal of all rejections that rely on a combination of Maeda and Sokol.

Appellant also traverses the Examiner's repeated allegation that Maeda is directed to a radiation curable composition. The Examiner appears to be alleging that Maeda can be properly combined with other cited references on this basis. For instance, in the most recent office action, the Examiner states that "Maeda, Sokol, and Wright all relate to the same art of radiation curing of an acrylate coating composition." (page 6). The Examiner also states that Maeda describes "drying or curing a coating by far infrared rays." (emphasis added) (page 3). This is simply untrue. The Maeda reference does not relate to radiation curing and does not describe any radiation curable compositions. There is no discussion of anything other than simply drying (i.e., solvent evaporation) by radiation (column 7, lines 45-46). No photoinitiators are discussed. There is no reason to believe that radiation curing, which suggests a polymerization or cross-linking reaction triggered by radiation exposure, is envisioned at all in Maeda.

#### Maeda Does Not Teach Curing a Coating After Application

As recited in independent Claim 1, the maskant of the invention is applied to the substrate and thereafter exposed to actinic radiation in order to cure the coating. The Examiner alleges that Maeda describes curing a coating after deposition onto a substrate. As noted above, the portion of column 7 relied upon by the Examiner mentions drying of the coating, not curing. A drying step would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art to mean evaporation of water. Drying and curing are not synonymous. Curing implies a polymerization or cross-linking reaction, which clearly does not occur after coating deposition in Maeda. Appellant directs the Board's attention to the summary section of Maeda where it states that the maskant composition



includes a copolymer (a), which obviously suggests that polymerization has already taken place. The Maeda reference teaches that the copolymer (a) can be prepared using the monomers, emulsifiers, and initiators described in columns 3-4. However, it is clear that the copolymer is formed by emulsion polymerization and then mixed with the remaining components (See column 5, lines 43-47, and the examples which include headings reciting "Preparation of copolymer latex (a)" and separate headings entitled "Preparation of water based maskant composition"). Thus, there is no support for the Examiner's contention that Maeda is directed to radiation curing, and particularly no support for the contention that a curing step takes place after depositing the coating described in Maeda. Contrary to statements made in the office actions, Maeda does not suggest the steps of applying a radiation curable composition and then exposing the coated substrate to actinic radiation to cure the maskant as recited in Claim 1 of the present application. For this additional reason, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 1, and all claims depending thereon, are patentable over the cited references and requests reversal of all rejections of record that rely on Maeda in this manner.

**Rejection of Claims 16, 19-21, 26, 28-32, 35, 39-42 and 43-46 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over the Maeda, Sokol, Wright and Lake references, Further in View of Either U.S. Pat. No. 5,126,005 to Blake or U.S. Pat. No. 4,585,519 to Jaffe *et al.***

As with the previous rejection discussed above, this rejection relies on the same combination of Maeda and Sokol. As explained above, there is no motivation to combine the Maeda and Sokol references. For this reason, Appellant respectfully requests the reversal of this rejection as well.

In addition, as noted above in connection with the previous rejection, the Maeda reference fails to teach or suggest applying a maskant composition and then curing the maskant composition. Both independent Claims 1 and 19 require these steps. Claim 19 recites that a maskant composition is applied to the substrate and that the composition is cured to form a cured peelable maskant film. Unlike Claim 19, Claim 1 requires that the maskant is a radiation curable and substantially solvent-free composition, but nonetheless recites a curing step after application of the maskant. As noted above, the Examiner alleges that Maeda teaches these steps. However,

as noted in connection with the previous rejection, Maeda actually only suggests application of a previously-cured polymeric coating, which can be dried, but not cured, after application. Since each claim implicated by this rejection is dependent on Claim 1 or Claim 19, for this additional reason, Appellant respectfully requests the reversal of this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 22-23, 27, 33-34, 37-38, and 48-49 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over the Combination of the Maeda, Sokol, and Blake or Jaffe references**

As with the previous rejections discussed above, this rejection relies on the same combination of Maeda and Sokol. As explained above, there is no motivation to combine the Maeda and Sokol references. For this reason, Appellant respectfully requests the reversal of this rejection as well.

In addition, as noted above in connection with the previous rejections, the Maeda reference fails to teach or suggest applying a maskant composition and then curing the maskant composition. Claim 19 recites that a maskant composition is applied to the substrate and that the composition is cured to form a cured peelable maskant film. Unlike Claim 19, Claim 48 requires that the maskant is a radiation curable and substantially solvent-free composition, but nonetheless recites a curing step after application of the maskant. As noted above, the Examiner alleges that Maeda teaches these steps. However, as noted in connection with the previous rejection, Maeda actually only suggests application of a previously-cured polymeric coating, which can be dried, but not cured, after application. Since each claim implicated by this rejection depends from Claim 19 or Claim 48, for this additional reason, Appellant respectfully requests the reversal of this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 24-25 and 36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over the Maeda reference in View of Either Blake or Jaffe, Further in View of Sokol, and Further in View of U. S. Pat. No. 6,136,880 to Snowwhite *et al.***

As with the previous rejections discussed above, this rejection relies on the same combination of Maeda and Sokol. As explained above, there is no motivation to combine the

Maeda and Sokol references. For this reason, Appellant respectfully requests the reversal of this rejection as well.

In addition, as noted above in connection with the previous rejections, the Maeda reference fails to teach or suggest applying a maskant composition and then curing the maskant composition. Claim 19 recites that a maskant composition is applied to the substrate and that the composition is cured to form a cured peelable maskant film. As noted above, the Examiner alleges that Maeda teaches these steps. However, as noted in connection with the previous rejection, Maeda actually only suggests application of a previously-cured polymeric coating, which can be dried, but not cured, after application. Since each claim implicated by this rejection depends from Claim 19, for this additional reason, Appellant respectfully requests the reversal of this rejection.

**Rejection of Claim 47 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over the Maeda and Sokol  
References in View of Either Blake or Jaffe, and Further in View of U.S. Pat. No. 4,716,270  
to Gnanamuthu *et al.***


As with the previous rejections discussed above, this rejection relies on the same combination of Maeda and Sokol. As explained above, there is no motivation to combine the Maeda and Sokol references. For this reason, Appellant respectfully requests the reversal of this rejection as well.

In addition, as noted above in connection with the previous rejections, the Maeda reference fails to teach or suggest applying a maskant composition and then curing the maskant composition. Claim 19 recites that a maskant composition is applied to the substrate and that the composition is cured to form a cured peelable maskant film. As noted above, the Examiner alleges that Maeda teaches these steps. However, as noted in connection with the previous rejection, Maeda actually only suggests application of a previously-cured polymeric coating, which can be dried, but not cured, after application. Since Claim 47 depends from Claim 19, for this additional reason, Appellant respectfully requests the reversal of this rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing arguments, Appellant respectfully submits that Claims 1-49 are patentable over the cited references. A decision from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reversing the final rejection of the pending claims is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,




Christopher M. Humphrey  
Registration No. 43,683

**CUSTOMER NO. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Raleigh Office (919) 862-2200  
Fax Raleigh Office (919) 862-2260

"Express Mail" mailing label number EV 387070178 US  
Date of Deposit: February 11, 2005

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to:  
Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



Polly P. Burton

**CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. (original) A method of protecting selected portions of a metal substrate from chemical exposure, comprising:

applying a maskant coating composition to at least a portion of the surface of a metal substrate, the maskant composition being radiation curable and substantially solvent-free;  
exposing the coated substrate to actinic radiation to cure the maskant composition and form a cured peelable maskant film adhered to the metal substrate; and  
subjecting the coated substrate to a chemical treatment.

2. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the metal substrate is selected from the group consisting of aluminum, steel, titanium and alloys thereof.

3. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the maskant composition comprises at least one polymerizable monomer or oligomer and a photoinitiator.

4. (original) The method of Claim 3, wherein the at least one polymerizable monomer or oligomer is selected from the group consisting of acrylates, diacrylates, urethane acrylates or diacrylates, and mixtures thereof.

5. (original) The method of Claim 3, wherein the at least one polymerizable monomer or oligomer is selected from the group consisting of isobornyl acrylate, isooctyl acrylate, aliphatic urethane acrylate, aliphatic polyester-based urethane acrylate, aromatic urethane acrylate, siliconized urethane acrylate, polybutadiene urethane diacrylate, and mixtures thereof.

6. (previously presented) The method of Claim 3, wherein the photoinitiator is selected from the group consisting of 1-hydroxycyclohexyl phenyl ketone, bis (2,6-dimethoxybenzoyl)-2,4,4-trimethylpentyl phosphine oxide, 2-hydroxy-2-methyl-1-phenyl-propan-1-one, trimethylbenzophenone, methylbenzophenone, bis acyl phosphine oxide, and mixtures thereof.

7. (original) The method of Claim 3, wherein the maskant composition further comprises a filler.
8. (original) The method of Claim 7, wherein the filler is selected from the group consisting of talc and fumed silica.
9. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein said exposing step comprises exposing the coated substrate to ultraviolet radiation, black light radiation or visible light radiation.
10. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein said exposing step comprises exposing the coated substrate to ultraviolet radiation by moving the substrate past at least one ultraviolet light or moving the ultraviolet light past the substrate.
11. (previously presented) The method of Claim 1, wherein said exposing step comprises exposing the coated substrate to at least one ultraviolet radiation source having a wavelength of about 200 nm to about 450 nm and an intensity of about 120 W/cm<sup>2</sup> to about 185 W/cm<sup>2</sup>.
12. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein said exposing step comprises exposing the coated substrate to radiation at a rate of about 1 to about 10 feet of substrate/minute.
13. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the cured maskant film has a thickness of about 5 to about 20 mils.
14. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the cured maskant film has a peel strength of about 3 oz./inch to about 30 oz./inch.
15. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein said applying step comprises applying the maskant composition by spraying the composition, applying the composition with a roller, applying the composition with a blade, or by dipping the substrate in the maskant composition.

16. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the metal substrate has a first side and a second side, and said method comprises:

applying the maskant coating composition to at least a portion of the first side of the metal substrate;

exposing the first coated side of the substrate to actinic radiation to cure the maskant composition and form a cured peelable maskant film adhered to the first side of the metal substrate;

applying the maskant coating composition to at least a portion of the second side of the metal substrate; and

exposing the second coated side of the substrate to actinic radiation to cure the maskant composition and form a cured peelable maskant film adhered to the second side of the metal substrate.

17. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the chemical treatment is selected from the group consisting of chemical milling, anodizing and deoxidizing.

18. (original) The method of Claim 1, wherein said subjecting step comprises immersing the substrate in a chemical bath.

19. (original) A method of protecting selected portions of a metal substrate from chemical exposure, comprising:

applying a maskant coating composition to at least a portion of the surface of a metal substrate;

curing the maskant coating composition to form a cured peelable maskant film adhered to the metal substrate;

scribing a predetermined pattern of lines in the maskant film, the scribed lines outlining portions of the maskant film to be removed;

applying a sealant composition to the scribed lines in the maskant film, the line sealant composition being radiation curable and substantially solvent-free;

exposing the line sealant composition to actinic radiation to cure the line sealant composition;

peeling off a portion of the maskant film outlined by the scribed lines; and  
subjecting the coated substrate to a chemical treatment.

20. (original) The method of Claim 19, wherein the line sealant composition comprises at least one polymerizable monomer or oligomer and a photoinitiator.

21. (original) The method of Claim 20, wherein the at least one polymerizable monomer or oligomer is selected from the group consisting of acrylates, diacrylates, urethane acrylates or diacrylates, and mixtures thereof.

22. (original) The method of Claim 20, wherein the at least one polymerizable monomer is selected from the group consisting of isobornyl acrylate, isooctyl acrylate, urethane acrylate, and mixtures thereof.

23. (original) The method of Claim 20, wherein the photoinitiator is selected from the group consisting of bis acyl phosphine oxide, 1-hydroxycyclohexyl phenyl ketone, and mixtures thereof.

24. (original) The method of Claim 20, wherein the line sealant composition further comprises a wax and a synergist.

25. (original) The method of Claim 24, wherein the synergist is triethanolamine.

26. (original) The method of Claim 19, wherein said step of applying the line sealant composition comprises applying the sealant composition with a roller or applying the sealant composition with cheesecloth.



27. (original) The method of Claim 19, wherein said step of exposing the line sealant composition to actinic radiation comprises exposing the sealant composition to ultraviolet radiation, black light radiation or visible light radiation.

28. (previously presented) The method of Claim 19, wherein said step of exposing the line sealant composition to actinic radiation comprises exposing the sealant composition to a radiation source emitting radiation at a wavelength of about 200 to about 450 nm and having an intensity of about 100 W/cm<sup>2</sup> to about 600 W/cm<sup>2</sup>.

29. (original) The method of Claim 19, wherein the metal substrate is selected from the group consisting of aluminum, steel, titanium and alloys thereof.

30. (original) The method of Claim 19, wherein said step of applying a maskant coating composition comprises applying a radiation curable and substantially solvent-free maskant composition and said step of curing the maskant composition comprises exposing the maskant composition to actinic radiation to form a cured peelable maskant film adhered to the metal substrate.

31. (original) The method of Claim 30, wherein the maskant composition comprises at least one polymerizable monomer or oligomer and a photoinitiator.

32. (original) The method of Claim 31, wherein the at least one polymerizable monomer or oligomer is selected from the group consisting of acrylates, diacrylates, urethane acrylates or diacrylates, and mixtures thereof.

33. (original) The method of Claim 31, wherein the at least one polymerizable monomer or oligomer is selected from the group consisting of isobornyl acrylate, isooctyl acrylate, aliphatic urethane acrylate, aliphatic polyester-based urethane acrylate, aromatic urethane acrylate, siliconized urethane acrylate, polybutadiene urethane diacrylate, and mixtures thereof.

34. (previously presented) The method of Claim 31, wherein the photoinitiator is selected from the group consisting of 1-hydroxycyclohexyl phenyl ketone, bis (2,6-dimethoxybenzoyl)-2,4,4-trimethylpentyl phosphine oxide, 2-hydroxy-2-methyl-1-phenyl-propan-1-one, trimethylbenzophenone, methylbenzophenone, bis acyl phosphine oxide, and mixtures thereof.

35. (original) The method of Claim 31, wherein the maskant composition further comprises a filler.

36. (original) The method of Claim 25, wherein the filler is selected from the group consisting of talc and fumed silica.

37. (original) The method of Claim 30, wherein said step of exposing the maskant composition to actinic radiation comprises exposing the maskant composition to ultraviolet radiation, black light radiation or visible light radiation.

38. (original) The method of Claim 30, wherein said step of exposing the maskant composition to actinic radiation comprises exposing the maskant composition to ultraviolet radiation by moving the substrate past at least one ultraviolet light or moving the ultraviolet light past the substrate.

39. (previously presented) The method of Claim 30, wherein said step of exposing the maskant composition to actinic radiation comprises exposing the maskant composition to at least one ultraviolet radiation source having a wavelength of about 200 nm to about 450 nm and an intensity of about  $120 \text{ W/cm}^2$  to about  $185 \text{ W/cm}^2$ .

40. (original) The method of Claim 30, wherein the maskant composition is exposed to radiation at a rate of about 1 to about 10 feet of substrate/minute.

41. (original) The method of Claim 30, wherein the cured maskant film has a thickness of about 5 to about 20 mils.

42. (original) The method of Claim 30, wherein the cured maskant film has a peel strength of about 3 oz./inch to about 30 oz./inch.

43. (original) The method of Claim 30, wherein said step of applying a maskant composition comprises applying the maskant composition by spraying the composition, applying the composition with a roller, applying the composition with a blade, or by dipping the substrate in the maskant composition.

44. (original) The method of Claim 30, wherein the metal substrate has a first side and a second side, and said method comprises:

applying the maskant coating composition to at least a portion of the first side of the metal substrate;

exposing the first coated side of the substrate to actinic radiation to cure the maskant composition and form a cured peelable maskant film adhered to the first side of the metal substrate;

applying the maskant coating composition to at least a portion of the second side of the metal substrate; and

exposing the second coated side of the substrate to actinic radiation to cure the maskant composition and form a cured peelable maskant film adhered to the second side of the metal substrate.

45. (original) The method of Claim 19, wherein the chemical treatment is selected from the group consisting of chemical milling, anodizing and deoxidizing.

46. (original) The method of Claim 19, wherein said subjecting step comprises immersing the substrate in a chemical bath.

47. (original) The method of Claim 19, wherein said scribing step comprising scribing lines with a knife or a laser.

48. (original) A method of protecting selected portions of a metal substrate from chemical exposure, comprising:

applying a maskant coating composition to at least a portion of the surface of a metal substrate, the maskant composition being ultraviolet radiation curable and substantially solvent-free;

exposing the coated substrate to ultraviolet radiation to cure the maskant composition and form a cured peelable maskant film adhered to the metal substrate, the maskant having a peel strength of about 3 oz./inch to about 30 oz./inch;

scribing a predetermined pattern of lines in the maskant film, the scribed lines outlining portions of the maskant film to be removed;

applying a sealant composition to the scribed lines in the maskant film, the line sealant composition being radiation curable and substantially solvent-free;

exposing the line sealant composition to actinic radiation to cure the line sealant composition;

peeling off a portion of the maskant film outlined by the scribed lines; and  
immersing the substrate in a chemical milling bath.

49. (original) The method of Claim 48, wherein the metal substrate is an aluminum airplane fuselage panel.

50-63. (cancelled)